1890-91
(L.R.)

File No. 79 of 90.
Serial No: 1-18.

Appeal of Rangamma
Jigate Harihar Sns
Taluk regarding the Patili

P.F 11 of 96.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1890-1891

192 .

(L.R.)

File No. 79 of 90.

Serial Nos. 1-18

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-18

Part B for November 1900

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Rangamma, Jigali, Harihar Sub Taluk, regarding the Pateli.

WD 3288—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Countermarked

Appeal No 2906 of 15 Nov
1890

Appt
Rangappa
of Degili
Davangere Taluq
Chitaldroog Dt.

Respdt
Basanna

Appellant's father Odi Mallanna who was Patel ~~in 1860~~ transferred his appointment to his uncle's son Rangappa in 1865. Appt was not then born. Rangappa was dismissed in 1877 for certain irregularities in the collection work & the appointment given to Respdt who was one of the Hirekedars though not related to the dismissed man. Appt brought a suit in 1889, & the Asst Commr, finding that the appt was only 19 years old & that the suit was not therefore barred, decreed in favour of the appellant with a remark that he should receive the appointment by turns when rules are made for the same. The appellant ~~now claims the appointment in [illegible]~~ states that since his right has been recognised, the appointment should be given to him ~~at~~ once.—

~~Ap~~ The Govt consider that the appellant has no ~~claim whatever to an office which passed away from the family before he was born. & there is no reason for disturbing the~~ better claims to the office than the Respdt.

who is also a Hukdar. ~~[illegible]~~

~~Respondent~~ ~~[illegible]~~

~~appeal [illegible] be dismissed~~

claims can only be considered along with others when a vacancy occurs

U. C.

28/4/91 The appeal is dismissed

Endt

Pt. is informed that ~~the son has no right to claim an office which passed from his family before he was born~~ there is no reason for disturbing the possession of the Respdt. who is also a Hukdar. The appeal has been dismissed — Petitioner's claims will be considered along with others when a vacancy occurs —

U. C.

Chitaldrug Dt Commr's No 9250 13/5/97

order is confirmed on the ground that two patels are necessary.

[From the record it appears that the Govt admitted an appeal direct from the decision of the Genl Asst Commr of Chitaldroog in 1890. It is not quite clear how this came about]

Sub to 2nd councillor

M 4/6/97

Robson 4/6/97.

The appt ~~[illegible]~~ Sey's new is quite correct. The arrangement made by Mr S. Iyer is fair & Equitable. Ask the Dy Comr as to whether this arrangement was enforced & how it has been working

8/6/97

Draft docket to Dy Commr

M 9/6/97

No 106. Docketed 10/6/97.

(22)

PP1 to 6

Office note

Petition no 1900
dated 25th November
1895

Petitioner: Rungappa
Police Patel of
Jigali in Harihar
Sub Taluk

⊗

Plffs	Deft
Sannamallayya 2 Rungappa Son of Odomallayya	Malle Gowdan Basayya

In March 1890 the General asst Commr Chittoroog District passed a decree in Rev. ⊗ case no 4 of 1889-90 on the file of his Court declaring petitioner (2d Plff) to be entitled to be appointed to hold the office of Patel of Jigali village by turns with Basayya (Deft), and that the appointment of petitioner as Sun Patel could only be made, ~~[illegible]~~ after the Govt framed rules regarding the appointment of Patels by turns.

In November 1890

Petn no 2906 dated
① 15.11.90

the petitioner appealed to Govt against ~~the~~ above order and prayed that he might be allowed to do the Pateli duties ~~in~~ ~~question~~ immediately either by turns or otherwise and not made to wait indefinitely.

The Proceedings of the case were then called for and the case was heard in Council. The Govt passed the following decision:- ⑤ 28.11.91

"Appellant's father Odo Mallayya who was Patel, transferred his appointment to his uncle's son Rungappa in 1865. Appellant was not then born. Rungappa was dismissed in 1877 for certain irregularities in the collection work and the appointment given to Respondent who was one of the hukdars though not related to the dismissed man. Appellant brought a suit in 1889 and the assistant Commissioner finding that the appell was only 19 years old and that the suit was not therefore barred, decre in favor of the appellan with a remark that he should have the appoin-ment by turns when ent are made for the same The appellant states tha since his right has been recognized the appointme should be given to him a once.

The Govt consider tha the appellant has no better claims to the offic than the Respondent who is also a hukdar. His claims can only be consid-ed along with others when a vacancy occurs. The appe is dismissed." ⑧.

In March 1895 the petitioner complained to Govt that the Deputy Commr. had issued an order appointing him a Police Patel and one Murigappa as Revenue Patel of Jigali. The petition prayed that he might be allowed to do both the Police and the Revenue duties.

The petitioner not having produced the order appealed against was ordered to produce it.

6.4.95

In his Petition no. 2949 dated 26.4.95 the petitioner prayed that he might be granted one month's time for the production of the order appealed against. His prayer was granted.

Endt. no 2949 of 20-5-95

In June 1895 the petitioner complained to Govt. that the Deputy Commr. had not granted him copy of the order above referred to. Whereupon the Dy Commr. was requested in official memorandum $\frac{\text{Pet.}}{52}$ dated 6.7.95 to furnish ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ to the petitioner without delay, if he had put in an applⁿ, the copy applied for by him. This was communicated to Petr by endorst. issued on 11.7

+ no 3408 dated 12.6.95

In his Petition no. 1275 dated 25.9.95 the petitioner referred to a Petition dated 18-6-95 & stated that he had sent all the papers regarding his claim to the Pateli in question

No Petition of that date had been received & the order compld of had not been produced –

In reply an Endorsement
14 · 10 · 95 was issued to him ~~that~~ referring him to the above endorsement of 11 · 7 · 95 & stating he should produce copy of the Deputy Commissioner's judgment.

In petition (18) no 1701 dated 30 - 10 · 95 the petitioner stated that he had ~~produced~~ sent to this office copy of the Deputy Commr's order on 18 · 6 · 95 by post. That had not been received & An Endorsement was
18 · 11 · 95 again issued to him that the copy should be obtained & produced.

In his last petition (20) no 1900 dated 25 · 11 · 95 the petitioner states that some time ago he had sent by post to this office copy of the Deputy Commr's judgment, that it was doubtful whether the Dy Com mr would again grant him a copy of ~~the~~ the judgment and that he would pay the necessary charges if the ~~copy~~ Govt would kindly get ~~the~~

obtain the same direct
from the Deputy Commr.

B Ch
24-12-95

On the ~~Petition~~ of 12-6-95 which had been sent to the Dy Commr there is a note in pencil that copy was granted by the Dy Assistant on 17-6-95. If as Petr states he sent up a petn on 18-6-95 it is likely he forwarded the copy with it - the Petr may have sent the Petn but it has not been received.

The petn of 22-3-95, No 2474, is on sufficient stamp

Subd for orders.

There is nothing to prevent the Pltf applying for & obtaining another copy - You cannot know what the order appealed against is before further action can be taken and the Pltf can apply for & obtain one & submit it to Govt at a very early date

6/1/96

Dft appd
Rao
11-1-96

Sub
Copy of order passed by the Dy Commr on 12-1-95

is produced with Petition
No 584 d 7-8-96.

The first petn. of appeal from
that order was recd. on 26-3-95
No 2474.

In time
Stamp suffi.

Sub. for orders, with
a copy of the printed order
of 3rd ~~April~~ January 1894, No $\frac{10267-75}{R.1055}$.

R. 878

Call for a report
with record -
explaining
the relation of
the present
nominees to
the original
families who
contested before
Govt.
21.8.96

C
22.8.96

Basaya
|
Murugappa (appointed Rev. patel in 1893)
(Respondent)

Rangappa is the appellant.
Police patel.

Rd 3/8.

Draft on & endt. subs
vide 7/9

On receipt of the report,
the D. Comr ~~the~~ was directed that the
~~D. Comr~~ to report how the
arrangement effected by the
C Srinivasaiyengar worked.

The Dy Comm^r reports that the Dy Amildar of Hanhal has found the arrangement ~~to~~ work unsatisfactorily & that his (Dy Comm^r's) opinion is that the village is not large enough to require two patels.

If this view is accepted, the only person that will suffer is the appellant Rangappa (whose pet^n No 684 d/ 8/8/96 (Serial No 24) requires disposal.) ~~Muniyappa~~ ~~Henna~~

15/12/97.

The reports (there are two) are the last paper in Supplement No 4.

The 1st report shows that Muniyappa (respondent) was suspended for his neglect of the repair of boundary marks & was also impertinent.

In the 2nd report the Dy Comm^r states that ~~the~~ appointment of two patels has not conduced to efficiency & despatch of work. As the question before Govt is based on this and not on qualifications the suspension of respondent has to be ~~reple~~ omitted from consideration

The appeal was rejected & the D Comm^r was requested to report ~~on~~ as to how the arrangement of having 2 patels worked, after the lapse of a year.

The D Comm^r now reports that one patel is quite sufficient

If the Dy Commr's views is accepted, the question will arise as to which of the 2 patels shd be dispensed with. Notice will also have to be given to him before final orders are passed

23/3/99

In this office No $\frac{7133}{P.F11-96}$ of 12/4/99, the Dy Commr was asked to state whether there was one Patel [redacted] or two working and that if two, whom he would like to retain in office ~~the~~ together with his reason for his selection as well as the revenue and population of the village

In reply the Dy Commr states that there are 2 Patels for the village, one for Revenue and the other for Police work, that both of them having sided 2 parties the Dy Commr. had suspended them for a time and restored them afterwards and that if Govt. sanctioned the retention of only one Patel he would select the best man from among the Hakdars and appoint him sole Patel. The Dy Commr. further states that the revenue of the village is Rs 2026-9-0 and the population 939.

(For continuation vide serial No. (36) in the open file.

B.M.
21/1/00

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 43 of 1896–97

Appellant Rangappa

Respondent Murigappa

Subject:.. The Pateli office of Jegali village, Harihar Sub-Taluk. Whether the present arrangement of having 2 patels (one for Revenue & one for police) should not be revised, as it is said to be inconvenient

Posted for hearing on 25th October 1900 } Submitted to 1st Councillor

The Dy. Commr will appoint the better of the two patels and dispense with the other.

25.X.00

[illegible] 31/10/00.

25/10/1900

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—7-[illegible]0.—502.

Before the Government of Mysore.

43 of 96-97

Appellant. **Respondent.**

Rangappa Marigappa

Notices served on both parties

28-10-00

Both the parties absent.
Dy Commr's suggestion to be
appd

28/10/00

Central Jail Press, [illegible]

[illegible] 17.11.90 [illegible]

17.11.90 [illegible] ①

17.11.90 [illegible]

Connect Case

Submitted Connections [illegible] 91

[illegible]

[illegible]

No. 2906

[illegible]

Petition admitted. Case for [illegible] 22/6/91

L.R. [illegible]

16 — 11 — 90 [illegible]

[illegible] 25/12/91

[illegible]

2 [illegible]

3 [illegible]

4 [illegible]

[illegible]

31 [illegible]

[illegible]

5 [illegible]

[illegible]

6 [illegible]

[illegible] 1889-[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 42 [illegible]



[illegible]
[illegible] 31 [illegible]
[illegible] 18 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 31. 3. [illegible]
[illegible] 60.
[illegible]

COURT FEE

16-2-90

In the Court of the General Asst Commr. of the Chitaldrug District
Chitaldrug 31st March 1890.
Present - Narayan Aiyangar Offg. Asst Com
Revenue Case No. 4 of 1889-90.

Plaintiffs		Deft
1 Sanna Mallaiya son of Rangappa 2 Rangappa son of Oda-Mallaiya	Vs	Malle Gowdar Basaiya Potel of Jigali village Davangere Taluk -

Judgment

1. This is a suit for the Poteli of Jigali of the Davangere Taluk, of which the Defendant has been Potel from 9th June 1877.

2. A geneological table of the family of the plaintiffs was prepared and produced in the year 1866 and is filed with the record of that year which took place regarding this poteli. A Copy of it is now filed in this case. - - -

3. The Defendant has produced in

this Court a geneological table of his own family.

4. Both the families are quite unconnected with each other, though they belong to one and the same Lingayat Sect —

5. In the Poteli Register of 1835, an authenticated Copy of which has been produced by the Defendant the names of seven persons are entered as Hukdars, viz: 1 Malle-gowdar Bassaiya, 2 Ningaiya 3 Kari-hanumaiya, 4. Sanna Bassaiya, 5 Chindi Mallaiya, 6. Mallaiya and 7. Hotte Bassaiya. —

6. The Defendant claims No. 1 Malle-Gowdar Bassaiya as his uncle and No 2 Ningaiya as his father. —

7. In both the tables the name of Sanna Bassaiya occurs. In each of the families there was a man of that name. To which of these two families No 4 Sanna Bassaiya

of the Register of 1825 belonged is not quite clear, though it is probable that he was the same Sanna Bassaiya who in the table of the Plaintiffs occurs as the Sanaddar. He was the grand father of the 2nd Plaintiff. A list showing the distribution of Sanads, made to Potels of Mallebennur Sammat which is in the record of the District office shows that the Huzur Sanad for the Poteli of Bigali was given to Sanna Bassaiya Potel on the 27th August 1836.

8. In the Poteli Register of 1860, an authenticated copy of which is produced by the plaintiffs only one man is entered, viz that of Sanna Basaiya as the Potel, who obtained a Sanad from the Commissioner of the Mysore Province and in the Column of remarks it is stated that the Sanad was granted to him because he had been the Kadim or old Potel doing work —

9. In the year 1863 the aforesaid Sanaddar

Sanna Basaiya

Samma Basaiya represented that he was too old to perform the work and requested that one of his two sons 1 Chenna Basappa, and 2 Odo Mallaiya the latter who was fit might be appointed to succeed him, and ~~[illegible]~~ the Amildar of Harihar in his Ittilla No 426 of 27th October 1863 recommended the appointment of Odo Mallaiya and the same was sanctioned in Hukum No 248 of 29th October 1863 issued by the Deputy Supdt of the Shimoga District.

10. In the Poteli Register of 1865 which is in the records of the Deputy Commissioner's office the following names are entered as Hakdars: 1 Ira Bassaiya, 2 Malle Gowdar Basaiya 3 Mallaiya, 4 Odo Mallaiya, 5 Chimdi Mallaiya, 6 Mallaiya & 7 Mallaiya. Of these Odo Mallaiya is entered as doing the work under the Hukum No 248 of 29th October 1863 quoted above, by reason of his being the ~~[illegible]~~ son of the Samaddar.

11. On the 22nd November 1865 the said Odo Mallaiya and his elder brother presented

a petition stating that they had their private affairs and lands to look after and requesting that therefore their uncle's son Rangappa might be appointed Potel. An enquiry was made as to whether the remaining members of the Samaddar's family had any objections, and on their stating that they had none the said Rangappa was appointed Potel vide Hukam No 228 of 17th September [illegible]. Rangappa was the father of the 1st Plaintiff –

12. Rangappa performed the work till June 1877 when the Amildar of Davangere (the Taluk of Harihar having been added to Davangere) reported certain irregularities in the collection work against Rangappa. Thereupon in Hukam No 399 of 9th June 1877 Major Armstrong – Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldrug Dismissed Rangappa as being incompetent, and appointed the Deft. Malle gowdar Basappa who was taken to be one of the men entered in the Registers of 1865.

13. The Defendant has been Potel since the aforesaid Hukam No 399 of 9th June 1877 was brought into effect which seems to have been

with

within June 1877.

14. On the 25th August 1889 a petition signed by the 1st and 2nd Plaintiffs was addressed to the Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldrug stating that they were minors when the Defendant was appointed and requesting that either the one or the other of themselves be appointed in lieu of the Defendant. An endorsement No. 2208 of 2nd September 1889 was given to them to the effect that they might file a regular suit.

15. Accordingly the plaint was presented to the Deputy Commissioner on the 27th September 1889. In the heading of it the 1st Plaintiff alone was mentioned as the Plaintiff but it was signed by both the Plaintiffs and the prayer therein contained was that either the one or the other might be appointed Potel. When the case came on before me on the 1st occasion on the 23rd January 1890 both the two Plaintiffs appeared before me. Considering that both had signed the plaint petition and that the prayer was for the 2nd Plaintiff also, I thought that the omission to mention the name of the 2nd Plaintiff in the heading was simply due to ignorance on

the part of the petition writer. I therefore ordered that the 2nd Plaintiff should be joined as one of the Plaintiffs and that the case should be thoroughly enquired into by the Amildar on all the points arising in this case. —

16. The first point to be considered in this case is whether the suit is barred by limitation.

17 On the date of suit viz 27th September 1889 and even on the date of the prior petition viz 25th August 1889 more than 12 years had elapsed from the time of the appointment of the Defendant in June 1877 from which the cause of action arises. The 1st Plaintiff in his statement given before the Amildar on the 29th November 1889 has admitted that he is aged ~~about~~ 22 years. There can be no doubt that he is a little older than that, for, in the genealogical table of his family filed in the records of 1866 his name is entered as the 2nd son of Rangappa. This shows that the 1st Plaintiff had been born in 1866 and that he was not less than 23 years

of age when the plaint was filed. His minority ceased at the end of his 18th year, and under the last clause of section 7 of the limitation act he ought to have brought his suit within three years from the cessation of the disability, that is to say within his 21st year of age. My finding therefore is that the suit so far as the 1st Plaintiff Yanna Mallappa is concerned is barred.

18. As regards the 2nd plaintiff his name does not occur in the genealogical table prepared in 1866, showing thereby that he had not been born in that year when his father Odo Mallaiya transferred the office to his cousin Rangappa. The 2nd Plaintiff who appears to be much younger than the 1st plaintiff swears that he is now aged 19 years. The Amildar got the 2nd Plaintiff examined by the Hospital Asst and has filed in the record a certificate granted by him stating that the 2nd plaintiff is aged 19 years. The Amildar ought to have examined the Hospital Assistant on oath as to the certificate. If the case is remanded again for that purpose

a further delay would take place in the disposal of this long pending Case. It does not appear to be quite necessary to do so, in the absence of any evidence brought forward by the Defts to disprove the sworn statement of the 2nd Plaintiff about his age, and on seeing the 2nd Plaintiff in Court I have no hesitation in taking him to be about 19 years or at all events to within 21 years of age.

19. The appointment of Rangappa in 1866 by the Consent of Odo Mallaiya seems to have been a family arrangement and not one by which the Hak can be said to have been irrevocably alienated from himself and his heirs. In a matter of hereditary and family Haks such as a Poteli a liberal construction ought I think to be put on the act of one man of the family giving up the office to another of the same family. Construing ~~[illegible]~~ the arrangement of 1866 in a liberal spirit, it does not appear to me that that arrangement can be viewed as estopping Odo-Mallaiya and his heirs from

demurring to the appointment made at any future time of a person quite unconnected with their family. The office of Potel can only be held by a single member of a family at a time and Rangappa was appointed by common Consent of the members of that family - Rangappa was found fault with in his collection work and dismissed, but he was not found guilty in a Court of Justice of either Embazzlement of Government Revenue, nor of any other offence which is Capable of Extinguishing the Hak of the family

There is reason to believe that the office of Potel of this village was enjoyed by the members of the family of the Plaintiffs for more than 42 years thus: — from before 1835 up to 1863. Sanna Kasaiya to whom the Commissioner's Inam was granted in 1836, his son Edamallay father of the 2nd Plaintiff from 1863 up to September 1866, and then the Inamadar's brother's son Rangappa, father of the 1st Plaintiff — up to June 1877.

20.– If Rangappa was unfit it was only but fair and just to have made enquiries if others of his family were not fit or if the office could not be registered in the name of any minor of the family with a Competent Gumasta for him. But the papers show that no such enquiry was made, and the Deft. who is not Connected with the family of the Samaddar was appointed, on the ground that he was one of the Hakdars named in the Registers. I Consider that such members of the Samaddars' family as are not barred by limitation have a just ground to Complain against the exclusive appointment of the [illegible] Defts. The 2nd Plaintiff had been born when the said appointment was made and so in my opinion he has a Cause of action and is entitled to consideration as the grandson of the Samaddar in whose family the office continued 42 years. As he has not yet Completed 21 years of age, his Claim is not barred by Limitation.

21. The only question which now remains for Consideration is what relief can be granted to the 2nd Plaintiff. The Defendant was not an utter stranger to the Hak of the Patel; He is a member of one of the Hakdar familie according to the Registers and has been in office for a little more than 12 years - The 2nd Plaintiff as the member of another Hakdar family has got an equal right to the office along with the Defendant and in my opinion entitled to hold it by turns with the Deft. I can only declare such his right but cannot pass a decree to take immediate effect, the Government not having as yet made rules for regulating the appointment of Patels by turns, though they ~~were~~ have admitted the justice of making such appointment & have promised to frame rules, vide Appeal decision of the Deputy Commr in Rev: Case No. 6 of 1890.

22

22. The decree will be that the suit so far as the 1st Plaintiff is Concerned be dismissed as being barred by limitation; that the 2nd Plaintiff Rangappa son of Odo Mallaya be declared to be entitled to be appointed to hold the office of Potel of Jigali of the Davangere Taluk by turns with the Defendant Basainga, that the appointment of the 2nd Plaintiff as such Potel by turns Can only be made after the Government frame rules regarding the appointment of Potels by turns and subject to the Condition that the Dy Commissioner at the time of making the appointment finds the 2nd Plaintiff Competent and respectable for such appointment, and that each party should bear his own Costs.

/Sd/ Narayan Aiyangar.
Offg: Asst Commr.

True Copy:

Head Munshi
Genl: Asst Commr's Office
Chitaldurg District

Compd BV

Copy applied for 1.4.90

Do — ready 3.4.90

Do — delivered on 3.4.90

No. of words 1728 —

Copying fee 2 — 1 — „

Comparing fee — 7 — 4

COURT FEE
ONE RUPEE

In the Court of the General Assistant Commissioner of the Chitaldrug District.

This 31st day of March 1890.

Present – Narayan Aiyangar offg. Asst Commr.

Revenue Case No. 4 of 1889-90.

Plaintiffs.		Defts-
1 Sanna Mallappa Son of Rangaiya 2 Rangappa Son of Odo Mallappa	Vs	Malla Gowdar Bassaiya Patel of Jagali Davangere Taluk.

Decree

This suit Coming on for hearing this day and upon hearing the parties and on perusing the records of the Case, this Court doth order and decree that, the suit so far as the 1st Plaintiff is Concerned, be dismissed, as being barred by limitation that the 2nd Plaintiff Rangappa Son of Odo Mallaiya be declared to be entitled to be appointed to hold the office of Patel of Jigali of the Davangere Taluk by turns with the Defendant Basaiya; that the appointment of the 2nd Plaintiff as such Patel by turns can only be made after the Government frame rules regarding the appointment of Patels by turns and subject to the condition that the Deputy Commissioner at the time of making the appointment finds the 2nd Plaintiff competent and respectable for such appointment, and that each party should bear his own costs.

(Sd.) Narayan Aiyangar
Offg. Asst. Commr.
Chitaldroog Dist.)

Memo of Costs

	By Plaintiff	By Deft.
Plaint Petition	10 — —	— — —
Process fees	7 — 4 — „	„ — 8 — „
Miscellaneous	3 — „ — „	3 — 4 — „
Total Rs	20 — 4 — „	3 — 12 — „

(Signed) Narayan Aiyangar
Offg. A. Commr.

Compd.

True Copy
[illegible]

Copy applied for 1-4. 90

Do — ready 3. 4. 90

Do — delivered on 4. 4. 90.

No. of words. 210

Copying fee — 4 — 6

Comp: fee — 1 —

48 [illegible] 91

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
No.

[illegible] 24-4-95 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2-12-94ರ
[illegible] 320 [illegible]

Order

Petitioner Rangappa and his uncle's son Mallia are present. No other persons have come forward as hogdars. The Officiator Basiya appeared before me on the last occasion but is absent today. The judgment of the General Assistant Commissioner in the Revenue case No 4 of 189-90 and the Dewan's office Endorsement No 2906 dated $\underset{28}{22}$nd December 1891, show that both the petitioner Rangappa and the present officiator Basaiya are hogdars to the Pataly in question. Patro's family officiated for over 40 years (Vide the said judgment) and the present Officiator has only been in office 1877. The latter is by old age and bodily infirmi incompetent to perform the duties of this office has therefore to be removed. I make an order accordingly. In ~~appropriating~~ appointing a successor, it seems to me nothing but fair that the claims of bo the hogdar families should be taken into considera

The Village is a large one and it seems desirable that on the authority of the Pro of Govt. Oro No 10267-70 / R 1055 of 3/4/94 two persons should be appointed, one as Revenue Patail and the other as Police Patail - Petitioner Rangappa is a competent person and so is ~~Basappa's~~ Basaia's son Murgeppa. The former is appointed Police Patel and the latter Revenue Patel. The Police allowance will be paid to them in two equal shares.

(Sd) C. Sreenivasa Iyengar
Deputy Commissioner

[illegible] 301

[illegible]

[illegible] 28-12-9[illegible] 355/55 [illegible] 1-12-9[illegible] 322/373 [illegible] 12/1/95

(Sd) C Sreenivasa Rao
Deputy Commissioner

[illegible]

[illegible]

	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	258	95
	0-4-6	0-1-0
[illegible]	0-0-4	0-0-2
[illegible]	0-4-10	0-1-2 } 0-6-0

[illegible]

D Nala[illegible]
Deputy Amildar

No. 2906

Appt.
Ra gappa of Jigili,
Davangere Tk,
Chittaldrug Dt.

Respdt.
Basanna.

(6)

Endorsement.

In reply to ~~his~~ Petition dated 15th Novr '90 Petitioner is informed that there is no reason for disturbing the possession of the Respdt, who is also a Hukdar. The appeal has been dismissed. ~~is informed that~~ Petitioner's claims will be considered along with others when a vacancy occurs.

L. R. 79-90-2

2. The encls: are herewith returned.

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
22d/28 Decr 1891.

By Order,
~~Under~~ Secretary.

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

Draft.

Issued
28/12/91

- 14.11.10 No

L.R. 79-90-3

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

(2)

From the same No. 229 dd 24/5/91

The accompanying Petition No. 2906 dated 15th November/90 received at the Dewan's Office from Rangappa, Patail ~~[illegible]~~ Hakdar of Jigali village, Davengéré Taluk,

is forwarded, together with its 3 enclosures, to the Deputy Commr., Chitaldrug District for Submission of Proceedings and a precis thereof

By Order,
O.A.
~~For~~ Chief Secretary

BANGALORE,
2nd July 1891.

Draft

(General Serial No. 30)

189 / 4435
AUG. 9
P. 10

③

To the ante No. ~~[illegible]~~ 10481/P.448 d/22/12/91

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District.

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore.

Dated 4th }
Despatched 6th } August 1891.

Received
Returned to D.C. on 24/12/91

Enclosures No. 4. with Records sent Separately.

General No. 220.
No. 206.

Recd 11/8/91 ×

L.R. 79-90-4

Petition [illegible]
AS
28/8/91

× Enclosures herewith returned.

Submitted to the Council
14/8/91 AR

Hearing
19 Novr 1891
give notice to both parties.
MC
23/10/91

Adjourned to
26 December
1891
AS
4/11/91

Br
10-8-91

u/s His Official Memorandum No. 10 dated 2nd ultimo, calling for proceedings connected with the Potail huck of Jigali village in the Davangere Taluk.

Has the honor to submit herewith the entire record in his Revenue Original Case No. 4 of 1889-90 on the file of the General Assistant Commissioner of this District, and to

State that the English Judgment in the Case Contains a precis of the record.

Thomas M. Laffey

Deputy Commr.
Chitaldroog Dt.

Jcb

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 2906 of 15th Novr '90

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Rangappa of Jigili, Davangere Taluk, Chittaldrug Distt		Basanna.

L.R. 79-90-5

Decision. d/ 28·11·91.

Applt's father Oda Mallia, who was Potail, transferred his appointment to his uncle's son Rangappa in 1865. Appellant was not then born. Rangappa was dismissed in 1877 for certain irregularities in the collection work and the appointment given to Respdt who was one of the Hukdars, though not related to the dismissed man. Applt brought a suit in 1889, and the Asstt Commr, finding that the Applt was only 19 years old and that the suit was not therefore barred, decreed in favor of the Applt with a remark that he should have the appointment by turns when rules are made for the same. The Appt. states that since his right has been recognised, the appointment should be given to him at once.

The Govt. consider that the Appt. has no better claims to the office than the Respdt. w[illegible]is also a Hukdar. His claims can only be considered along with others when a vacancy occurs. The appeal is dismissed.

"By Order"

Sd

Under Secy

No. $\frac{10487}{P.44}$ $\frac{22}{25}$/12/91.

Copy forwarded to the Dy. Commr., Chittaldrug Distt., with the ver. papers recd. with his No. $\frac{220}{206}$ d/4.8.91.

"By Order"

Sd

Under Secretary

Re-draft.

J P

Referenced
15/8

(24)

1896

No. 584

Name of Petitioner, Rungappa - Police Patel

Village, Jigali

1. Taluk, Harihar

District, Chitaldroog

Date of Arzi, 7-8-96

Date of Receipt, 12-8-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 1

L.R. 79-90-6

ABSTRACT.

With reference to Endorsement No. 1900 of 11-1-96. begs to submit copy of judgment passed by the Dy. Commr. Chitaldroog Distt. and prays that on perusal thereof his appointment may be restored to him.

No. Pet—
7-11-96 Enc: three.

No. 243 of 96.

(25)

[illegible]
8-9-9

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

L.R. 79-90-7

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 2474 and 584 dated 22d March 1895 and 7 August 1896 received at the Dewan's Office from Rungappa of Jigali in the Harihar Sub Taluk appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr of Chitldroog regarding the Patel- of the said village

are ~~is~~ forwarded, together with any such ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Deputy Commissioner of the Chitldroog District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition, briefly expl

the relation of the present nominees to the original parties who contested before Govt.

2. The petition ~~with its enclosure~~ should be returned.

By order,

Draft e.c. 7/9
~~for Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,
7/8 - 9 - 1896

7/9

[illegible]

27-5-97 [illegible]

Pt 11 of 98 put up
AK
27/5

submitted with reference to the order of the Revenue Council on the Office note (serial no 22 in the file
[illegible] 28/5/97

Basappa was sole patel before the present dispute. As he was very old and otherwise afflicted with infirmity, the Dy Commr appointed Murigappa the appellant son of Basappa, & the Rungappa (who has been declared a coordinate hakdar with Basappa by the Genl Asst Commr & Govt) as Rev & police patels, under the authority of Go nos $\frac{1267-75}{R\ 1055}$ 83/1/94

The beriz of the village is said to be over 2000 Rs & hence the necessity for 2 patels

= It has been held in recent decisions of Govt that the above proceedings does not abrogate the principle of hereditary succession enunciated in the Land Rev Rules and that where the last incumbent leaves a competent heir, his claims shd not be overlooked. In this view appellant cannot get more than he has already got and should consider himself lucky if the Dy Commrs

---

– P.A. 11-96.

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 7826
Pet 692
21 MAY 97
DEWAN'S OFFICE

1897

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Government
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.
General and Revenue Depts:

~~L.R.~~ 79-90-8

Dated 13th May 1897

Despatched 14th

Received

Enclosures No. 4 and 3 files of records

General No. 925
No. 861.

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Submitting a ~~report~~ on the appeal petition of Rungappa of Jigali in the Harihar Sub Taluk, regarding the Pataile of Jigali village &c.

Petition 22/5/97

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office.)

25/5/97

RD
26/5

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldroog District
Dated 13th May 1897.

To

The Secretary to the Govt: of Mysore
General and Rev: Departments

Sir, With reference to your official memorandum No: Pet/7.11-96 dated 7th September 1896, forwarding petitions Nos: 2474 and 584 dated 22nd March and 7th August 1896 respectively received at the Dewan's Office from Rangappa of Jigali in the Harihar Sub Talook appealing against the Deputy Commissioner's orders regarding the Patali of the said village and calling for the submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case together with a full report of the facts and on the points urged in the petition &c, I have the honor to state as follows:—

2- In March 1893, the Shanbogue of the Jigali village reported to the Deputy Amildar stating that Patail Basappa who is old and who is both deaf and blind and consequently incapacitated for public service does not at all help him in the collection duty and that therefore some proper person should be nominated to help him in collection and other duties, the Revenue of the village being over 2000 Rs.

3. Thereupon the Deputy Amildar directed the Shekdar to render all possible help so far as revenue collection was concerned and to report upon the efficiency or otherwise of Potail Basappa for further service.

4. The Shekdar in reply reported that the leave application given by the Potail for one year on account of his illness was already sent to the Sub Talook for orders, that this Potail desires his nephew Sannabasappa to officiate for him during his absence and that Rangappa son of the former Potail Vôdômallaiya also puts in his claim for the office basing it on decree (in Revision Case No: 4 of 1889-90 on the file of the General Assistant Commissioner).

5. After some further enquiry in the matter the Deputy Amildar

recommended Rungappa (appeal petition) to act for Potail Basappa during his absence on leave as the former is the 2nd Son of the Original hakdar Vodo Mallaiya in preference to Sannabasaiya selected by the Potail to act for him.

6. The Deputy Commissioner nominated Sannabasaiya nephew of the Potail to officiate for him during his absence on leave and stated that Rungappa's Claims will be considered along with other hakdars on a vacancy occurring (Vide Dewan's Office Endorsement No: 2906 dated 28th December 1891 given to Rungappa). but this could not be considered then as the vacancy was only a temporary one.

7. After the expiry of this leave Potail Basaiya reported that the office may be restored to him but if the Sirkar should object to his restoration because of his infirmities (blindness and deafness) his Son Mruigappa may be appointed to act for him in room of his nephew Sannabasaiya who failed to provide to his maintenance when he officiated as the Potail.

8. The appeal petitioner Rungappa also presented a petition to the Deputy

Commissioner (Mr C. Sreenivasaiengar) bringing forward his Claims for the Office now that there was a permanent vacancy.

4. The Deputy Commissioner sent for the parties heard them and having gone through the records bearing on the subject, passed the following order:-

" Petitioner Rangappa and his Uncle's Son Mallaiya are present. No other persons have come forward as hakdars. The Officiator Bassaya appeared before me on the last occasion but is absent today. The Judgment of the General Assistant Commissioner in Revenue Case No. 4 of 1889-90 and the Dewan's Office Endorsement No. 2906 of 22th/28 December 1891 shew that both petitioner Rangappa and the present Officiator Bassaya are hakdars to the Potéli in question. Petitioner's Family Officiated for over 40 years (Vide the said Judgment) and the present Officiator has only been in Office since 1877. The latter is by old age and bodily infirmity incompetent to perform the duties of this Office. He has

He is therefore to be removed. I make an order accordingly. In appointing a successor, it seems to me nothing but fair, that the claims of both the Pakdar families should be taken into consideration. The village is a large one and it seems desirable that on the authority of the Proceedings of Government No. $\frac{10267-75}{R. 1055}$ dated 3rd April 1894 two persons should be appointed, one as Revenue Potail and the other as Police Potail. Petitioner Rungappa is a competent person and so is Bassaya's son Muniyappa. The former is appointed Police Potail and the latter Rev: Potail and the latter Revenue Potail. Repetition The Poliga allowance will be paid to them in two equal shares."

10. It is against this order that the present petitioner Rungappa now appeals to Government. I beg to add that the present nominees Rungappa and Muniyappa are respectively the appellant and the son of respondent Bassaiya in the suit contested before Government.

11. The memorandum papers bearing on the subject of this reference together with the appeal petitions are herewith submitted.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

189 7

From

The Secretary to Govt
Genl and Rev. Depts

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug Dt.

A. R. 79-90-9

Dated 10th
Despatched 15 June/97
Received
General No. 10863.
P.F. *No.* 11-96

(172)

Enclosure No.

The Deputy Commissioner's letter No $\frac{925}{861}$ dated 12th May 1897, reporting on the petition of Rangappa of Jigali in the Harihar Sub Taluk, appealing against the order of the then Dep. Commissioner, Mr. C. Sreenivasiengar, directing ~~the division of the Pateli office of Jigali, into Revenue + Police and~~ ~~appoin~~ the appointments of Rangappa and Timmagappa as Revenue and Police Patels in accordance with the Govt orders of ~~April~~ January 1894.

Fy the No & date here M

With reference to the above, has the honor to observe that the arrangement made by Mr C. Srinivasiengar is fair and equitable; and to request that a detailed report may be submitted as to whether this arrangement was enforced and how it has been working.

2. The records of the case with the petition and its enclosures are returned for reference and resubmission. [illegible] 952 6-97 [illegible]

By order

for Secretary

10/6/97

References
27-7-97

1897

No. 262

Name of Petitioner Rangappa Police Patel, son of Mallappa

Village Malebennur hobli Jigali village

Taluk Harihar (Sub)

District Chitaldurg.

Date of Arzi 18-7-97

Date of Receipt 23.7.97.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil.

ABSTRACT.

Petr begs to submit that he is the sole hakdar for both the Revenue and Police Pateli of the above village; that the Pateli work was being performed by only one person in the beginning; that about 3 years back on the report of the Amildar that the then Patel was [illegible] the Deputy Commissioner divided the Pateli into two divisions and assigned him the Police work while one Mungappa was appointed Revenue Patel; that he has been doing the Police Pateli work since that time; that the said

584 of 96 Memo No $\frac{Pet}{F11-96}$ D/ 8-9-96

H.U.R.
27/7

The above files put up.

AK
27/7/97

Submitted
[illegible]
28/7/97

To Deputy Commr in Entry docket
L.R. 79-90-10
M 29/7/97

RD 30/7/97
Drafted
30/7/97

was suspended recently; that the Deputy Commissioner in spite of his link for the whole Patelki appointed one Gurubasappa a ryot having no claim to the office as Revenue Patel; that he had appealed to Govt in 1895 in the said matter; that he was asked in Endt No 2474 dated 13-4-95 to produce the records which he did with his application dated 7.8.96 and the same has been acknowledged by Govt; that though it is ~~more than~~ about a year since that time no final orders have yet been passed. States also

That, ~~[illegible]~~ he was given Sanad in 2.2.92 on his petition of 1891 that ~~the other Patel~~ who is he will be appointed Sole patel when there is a vacancy —

Prays therefore that the entire records may be perused and orders issued to appoint him the Sole patel of the village

26/7/97

262

By ...
Abstract
MJ 22/7/97

Refer

[illegible]

PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. No. 262 R
22-7-97

[illegible]

[illegible] 1897 [illegible] 18 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 13-4-95 [illegible]

[illegible]
2474

[illegible]

[illegible] 7-8-96 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 12-8-96 [illegible] 15 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1891 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 2-2-92 [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 10-12 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Pet / 7.11-96 ✓ Inst [illegible]

4/8/97

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

(50)

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Pn

L.R. 79-90 — 11

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying ~~Appeal~~ Petition Registered No. 262 dated 18.7.97 received at the Dewan's Office from — Rangappa, Police Patel, Malebennur hobli, Jigali village, Harihar Sub Taluk, praying that he may be appointed the sole patel of the village

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosure,~~ to the Deputy Commissioner of the Chitaldrug District, for disposal, in continuation of this office docket No. 10863 / P. 7.11-96 dated 10th June 1897

By order,

for Secretary

BANGALORE,
~~4th Jul~~ 3rd 8 1897

30/7/97

[illegible]

10-11-97

O.F. 11796 put up.

AK
10/11/97

Submitted
AK
10/11/97

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

189

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

3261

10 NOV 97

DEWAN'S OFFICE

(31)

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt
Dewan of Mysore.
General and Revenue
Departments

Subd to 2nd Councillor
with office note Cond.

My 15/11/97

L. R. 79-90-12

Dated 2d
Despatched 3d November
1897
Received

Enclosures No. 1 File N.P.

General No. [illegible]26
No. 203

In reply to

Rcd 7 P.M.
15. 11. 97.

SUBJECT.

Stating that the village of Jigali is not such a large one as to require two separate Patels one for Revenue and another for Police duties.

The Petrs appeal [illegible] of consid rejected. As agt Muniyappa the Petr has no preferential claims, and he cannot be appd sole Patel with the exclusion of Muniyappa who is the son of 2 heir of the last holder & officiator Basappa.

The DC may allow the arrangement of joint Patels to continue for another year & then report if any change is called

[illegible]
15/11/97

References—(to be entered only in the Dawan's Office).

Rev Peter
8/11/97

Rcd
10/11

No 426/403 Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldrug District
Dated, Chitaldrug, 2nd November 1897
6th

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Departments

Sir,

With reference to your docket No: 10863/Ptn 11-96 dated 10th June last, regarding the Pateli Office of Jigali Village, Harihar Sub Taluk, I have the honor to state that the late Deputy Commissioner Mr. Srinivasiengar's Order regarding the splitting up of the Office of Pateli into a Police Pateli and a Revenue Pateli was given effect to.

2. The Deputy Amildar reports that the arrangement has not worked satisfactorily owing to both Patels shirking their responsibility and trying to throw blame on the other

My own Opinion is that the Village is not such a large one as to require two separate Patêls. One for revenue and another for the Police duties

3. The Vernacular papers on the subject are herewith re-transmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner

2 drafts

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

L.R. 79-90-13

Read: (32)

Petition No 2474 dated 22-3-95 from Rangappa Patel hukdar of Jigalé village in the Harihar Taluk, appealing against the order of the Dy. Com. Chitaldrug Dt ~~directing~~ ~~the~~ appoint~~ment of~~ing the Pet. and Venigappa as Police and Revenue Patels (for the Jigali village) respectively; and praying that he may be appointed ~~as~~ Sole patel of the village.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No $\frac{426}{403}$ dated 2nd November 1889, from the Dy. Com. Chitaldrug Dt, stating that ~~in response to the above~~ ~~it has been reported by~~ the Dy. Amildar has reported that the above arrangement of having two patels for the village had not

worked satisfactorily owing to both patels in shirking their responsibility and trying to throw blame on the other; and that he (Dy. Commr) is of opinion that the village is not such a large one as to require separate Patels one for Rev. and another for Police

The records of the case ~~are~~ thereon $\frac{6090}{12\text{-}7\ 11\text{ Jan }96}$.

P
8 (826) 7.1.98
7/8

Petitioner Rangappa has no preferential claims as against Munigappa and he cannot be appointed sole patel to the exclusion of the said Muni-gappa who is the son and heir of the last-holder ~~[illegible]~~ Basappa. The appeal is accordingly rejected.

2. The Dy Commr may allow the arrangement of joint Patels to continue for another year and then report if any change is called for.

M

Von Secretary
~~[illegible]~~ 20/12/97

To the Dy. Commr, Chitaldrug Dt with records.

Noted
MD 27-1-98

L.R. 79-90-14

[illegible] 8-1-98

[illegible] 2474 [illegible] 2 drafts [illegible]

32

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22-3-95 [illegible]

[illegible]

5-1-98.

Vide [illegible]
21.3.99

Genl: Records.
Pl. see put up G.O. 11-7-96.

AK
22/3/99

Police Br:—
P.G. 11-96 regs. put up
[illegible]
23/3/99

Subd to 2nd Councillor with
Office note. Contd.
[illegible] 23/3/99

Mlly
23.3.99

L.R. 79-90-15

As 7 Am.
24.3.99.

Ascertain if there is only one Patel now working or two. If two whom would the D.C. have, & the reasons for his selection - Let us know also the area revenue & population of the village
6.4.99

Docd
[illegible]
8/4/99

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

1899

5855
MAR 1 99
Pol 359

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District.

To
The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the
Government *~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.*
General and Revenue Depts

Dated 15th

Despatched 18th March 1899

Received

Enclosures No. —

General No. 737.

No. 710.

In reply to

SUBJECT

Stating that one Patel will be quite enough to manage both the Revenue and the Police duties in the Jigali village Harihar Sub Taluk as the arrangement of having two patels for the village failed to work satisfactorily.

References—(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

1049

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldrug District

No: 737/710. Dated 15th March 1899

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldrug District

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General and Revenue Depts

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No 6090/Sel 7 11-96 dated the 7th January 1898 I have the honor to report that the arrangement of having two patels for Jigali village in the Harihar Sub Taluk was allowed to continue for one year, but it has failed to work satisfactorily. I think one Patel will be quite enough to manage both the revenue and the police duties of the village satisfactorily.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

For Deputy Commissioner

C.S.

1899 (39)

From

The Secretary to Govt.
Genl. and Rev: Depts.

To

The Dy Commissioner
Chitaldurg Dt.

L.R. 79-90=16

Dated 12th
Despatched 13th April/99.
Received

General No. 7133. P
P.F. *No.* 11-96

(288)

Enclosure No.

The Dy Commr's letter No. 737 dated 15th March 1899, 710 stating with reference to Govt. Pro. No. 6090 P.F. 11-96 dated 7th Jany 98, that one Patel will be quite sufficient to manage both the Revenue and Police duties in the Jigali village, Harihar Sub-Taluk.

With reference to the above, has the honor to request submission of a further report as to whether there is only one Patel now working or two, and if two whom ~~[illegible]~~ the Dy Commr would like to together with the reasons for ~~[illegible]~~ name selection for his ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~

Information about the revenue and popula-tion of the village should also be ~~[illegible]~~ supplied

By order

for Secretary

e a
7-4-99 }

8/4/99

1133
Ref 581
1899-1900

(36)

From The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District

To The Secretary to the Government of
Mysore General and Revenue
Departments
Bangalore

Dated 11th August 1899

Despatched 16th August 1899

Received

General No. 108
No. 106

Enclosure No. --

Submitting a further report regarding the appointment of a Patel to manage both the Revenue and Police duties of the Jigali Village, Harihar Sub-Taluk.

Subd to Rev Cr & Dr

Mlly
24.8.99 The Dy Comr desires the Govt to pass an order stating that one patel is sufficient for the ~~part~~ village of Jigali. As there are at present 2 patels, and as the services of atleast one of them will have to be dispensed with, it seems necessary to hear both the parties

My 29/8/99

L.R. 79-90-17

R. 31/8/99
Chikkanayakanhalli.
160

This is all right I think the system of appointing two patels is wrong & should be revised

The pages are written in an illegible hand & take a lot of time to decipher. Can't you employ men that can write a neat & readable hand

Pet. R
19.8.99

Recd
23/8. R.F. 11 of 96 relating to the subject is put up

AK
23/8/99

please get some other
clerk to write
Rao & abstract
[illegible]
21-11-99

1899

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Chitaldroog District,

No. $\frac{108}{106}$ Dated 11th August 1899

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Chitaldroog District.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
General and Rev: Depatts

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. $\frac{7133}{Ref\ 11\text{-}96}$ of the 12th April last calling for further report regarding the appointment of a Patel to manage both the Revenue and Police duties of the Jigali village Harihar sub Taluk I have the honor to state that, at present, there are two Patels employed in the village one for the Revenue and the other for the Police duties. Both of them are reported to be unsuitable for the office, just at present, owing to their having identified themselves with two parties into which the village has been divided.

2. I had suspended both the Patels for sometime and after a while, restored them. If Government sanction the retention of one Patel, I shall select the best man from the Hakdars and appoint him; or, if one of the present two men gives adequate guarantee for his good behaviour in future, he will be retained.

3. The annual revenue of the village amounts to Rs-2026-9-0 and the population thereof, is 939.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant
DKWarashah
For Deputy Commissioner

Proceedings of the Govt. of Mysore.

Appeal No. 43 of 1896-97.

L.R. 79-90-18

Appell:	Respondent
Rangappa	Muniyappa.

Read

Correspondence ending with letter No. $\frac{108}{106}$, dated the 11th August, 1899, from the Dy. Commr. Chitaldrug Dt., reporting, with reference to para 2 of Govt. Pro: No. $\frac{6090}{L.7\ 11-96}$ d/ 8-1-98, that the arrangement of having two patels ~~for~~ (one Revenue and the other Police ~~Patel~~) for Jigali village in the Harihar Sub. Taluk, had failed to work satisfactorily and that one Patel was quite enough to manage both the revenue and the police duties ~~of the said village~~

Order thereon No $\frac{3692}{\text{Rt 711-97}}$ P (98)
dated Bangalore $\frac{3^d}{3}$ Novr/900

The Dy. Commr. will appoint the better of the two Patels and dispense with the other.

Ns
31/10/00.

Secy

The Dy. Commr. Chitaldrug Dt.
with records.

31/10/00